IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant : Joseph Barrett et al.   Art Unit   : 2153
Serial No. : 09/666,140   Examiner : Kimberly D. Flynn
Filed   : September 20, 2000
Title   : SECURING AN ACCESSIBLE COMPUTER SYSTEM

Mail Stop Amendment
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

<u>REPLY TO ACTION OF JANUARY 27, 2005</u>

Claims 1-37 are pending, with claims 1, 15, and 25 being independent.

Claims 1-9, 13-19, 23-29 and 34-37 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Eichstaedt (U.S. 6,662,230). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 1 recites a method for securing an accessible computer system that includes monitoring a computer system for connection transactions between multiple access requestors and multiple access providers using a switching component connected to the multiple access providers and denying access by an attacking access requestor to the access providers when a number of connection transactions initiated by the attacking access requestor through the switching component exceeds a configurable threshold number during a first configurable period of time. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection because Eichstaedt fails to describe or suggest monitoring connection transactions between multiple access requestors and multiple access providers using a switching component.

Instead, the office action refers to gateway server (22) of Fig. 1 as the switching component that monitors multiple connection transactions. However, the gateway server 22 does not monitor the connection transactions between multiple access requestors and multiple access providers. Rather, gateway server 22 is merely described as part of a local area network (LAN) that provides access for corporate clients 14 to the Internet 10. See, Eichstaedt, col. 5, lines 24-25 and 37-39.

Rather, as relied-upon in the Office Action, Eichstaedt describes a method for "protecting a web server from abusive clients." See Eichstaedt, col. 11, lines 63-64. The "web server" in Eichstaedt seems to suggest a single access provider, and not multiple access providers, where a